



**FILED**

06-18-07  
04:59 PM

A0706018

# Exhibit D

April 18, 2007

To: All 760 NPA Code Holders and Interested Industry Members (California)

Subject: Final Meeting Minutes

On April 18, 2007, NANPA conducted a meeting via conference call to review and approve the attached minutes from the March 14 meeting for relief of the 760 NPA. These minutes were approved as of this date.

If you have any questions, please give me a call at (805) 520-1945 or via email at [joe.cocke@neustar.biz](mailto:joe.cocke@neustar.biz).

Sincerely,

*Joseph R. Cocke*  
Sr. NPA Relief Planner  
NANPA

C: Cherrie Conner – CPUC – Telecom Division

Attachments

**CALIFORNIA 760 NPA  
FOLLOWUP TO PUBLIC MEETINGS  
FINAL MINUTES  
March 14, 2007, 10:00 AM (PT)  
VIA CONFERENCE CALL**

**WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS & AGENDA REVIEW**

Mr. Joe Cocke, NeuStar NANPA Senior NPA Relief Planner opened the meeting with introductions, a review of the agenda, the objectives of the meeting and NANPA's roles and responsibilities. A list of the attendees can be found in Attachment # 1.

**CONSENSUS PROCESS AND NPA RELIEF PLANNING GUIDELINES**

Joe stated the ATIS (Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions) approved industry consensus process would be followed. He read highlights of the consensus process and explained how consensus is determined. In addition Joe stated that issues or positions could be expressed in the form of a Statement for the Record (in writing) and they could be conveyed at any point during the meetings. Silence will be considered agreement with a proposal, based on those on the call at the time for which consensus is called.

**PURPOSE OF MEETING**

Joe gave an overview of the 760 history of relief planning back in 1998 which resulted in the CPUC deciding on a geographic split with the north San Diego area changing to the 442 NPA and then suspended the order due to the extension of the forecasted exhaust. NANPA has assigned the 442 NPA as the new relief NPA. With the forecasted exhaust at 3Q2009, the CPUC-staff has requested NANPA to convene a meeting with the industry to update the recommended relief alternatives. Additionally, the CPUC has determined that because so much time has passed and the requirements in the PU Code, another round of local jurisdiction and public meetings would be held. Two local jurisdiction meetings and four public meetings were held. The staff and NANPA conducted the public meetings and presented three relief alternatives to the public. After the industry reviews the results of the public meetings today the results of this planning process will be filed with the CPUC.

**STATUS OF CALIFORNIA 760 NPA**

Joe stated that as of March 14, 2006, there are 722 codes assigned, 44 codes available for assignment in the lottery plus 16 codes set aside for the Pooling Administration for a total of 60 codes remaining for assignment in this NPA; and a total of 18 Un-Assignable codes (UAs). Joe reviewed the seventeen UA codes as follows: N11s, 442, 555, 570, 700, 760, 853, 950, 958, 959 and 976. There are 84 rate areas in the 760 NPA – 60 are mandatory pooling, 2 are mandatory pooling–single service provider rate centers, 21 are optional pooling rate centers and 1 is excluded from pooling. Joe provided the 2006 code assignments as follows: Jan=3, Feb=0, Mar=8, Apr=2, May=1, Jun=0, Jul=1, Aug=4, Sep=2, Oct=0, Nov=0, Dec=1 for a total of 22 assigned plus one assignment in January, three in February and two so far in March 2007. Jeopardy was declared in February 1999 and the current rationed rate is 2 codes per month. Joe informed the participants that at the present rationed rate the current October 2006 NRUF forecast projects the 760 to exhaust in 3Q2009 (he mentioned this forecast is not expected to change with the next publication of the April 2007 NRUF forecast. The October NRUF forecasted demand rate is 46 codes per year which equates to 3.8 codes per month and is used in

the projected lives of the alternatives. Kevin Gatchell, Pooling Administration, stated there were 480 blocks assigned in the past year, 1001 blocks are available, that 25 codes (20 for pool replenishment and 5 for LRNs) have been assigned in the last 12 months and their present forecast will require 17 codes in the next twelve months. He also mentioned the 760 has been in pooling since August 2002.

## **REVIEW RELIEF ALTERNATIVES PRESENTED TO THE PUBLIC**

There were two 2-way split alternatives (Alt # 1 & alt # 4) and one all services overlay alternative (Alt # 3) presented at the public meetings.

### **Alternative # 1 – NPA Split**

The proposed boundary line basically follows the San Diego County line to the Mexican border. There are 14 rate areas west of the split line in Area B and 70 rate areas east and north of the split line in Area A. This alternative keeps the cities and communities, on both sides of the split line, in tact, and does not split any cities. This is the same split previously ordered by the CPUC.

The projected lives are: area A is 14 years and Area B is 22 years.

The pros and cons listed by the industry at the October meeting are as follows:

Pros:

Keeps the cities on both sides of the split line in tact.

Maintains seven digit dialing on each side of the split

A split is more cost effective for Frontier Telco than an overlay

Cons:

This alternative splits LATA 732

Imbalanced projected lives

Additional complexity due to porting with a split

Negative Customer impacts to change telephone numbers, business cards, letter heads etc.

Requires businesses to re-educate their customers of new numbers

### **Alternative #4 – NPA Split**

The split boundary line basically follows the southern border of the Salton rate center and then along the eastern borders of the Calipatria, Brawley and Holtville rate centers to the Mexican border. This split retains those rate centers in LATA 732 in one area code. There are 21 rate areas west of the split line in Area B and 63 rate areas east and north of the split line in Area A.

The proposed split keeps the northern San Diego County and Imperial Valley together. This alternative keeps the cities and communities, on both sides of the split line, in tact, and does not split any cities. The projected lives are: Area A is 18 years and Area B is 16 years.

The pros and cons listed by the industry at the October meeting are as follows:

Pros:

Keeps the cities on both sides of the split line in tact.

Keeps the Salton rate center communities of interest with the Indio area.

Similar to Alt # 2 – the projected lives are closer in balance.

Keeps LATAs in tact

A split is more cost effective for Frontier Telco than an overlay

Cons:

Imperial County gets two area codes.

Additional complexity due to porting with a split

Negative Customer impacts to change telephone numbers, business cards, letter heads etc.

Requires businesses to re-educate their customers of new numbers

### **Alternative # 3 – All Services Overlay**

This alternative is an all services distributed overlay. Customers would retain their current telephone numbers; 1 plus ten-digit dialing by all customers between and within area codes in the area covered by the new area code would be required. The projected life of the overlay is 17 years. The pros and cons listed by the industry at the October meeting are as follows:

Pros:

No customers change their phone number and no cities will be split any further,

Recent experience with 310 overlay resulted in fewer customer complaints than the 909 split,

No change in the geographic area of the 760 NPA and it does not shrink.

No one has to change their existing area code.

No consumers on the wrong side of the split, all are treated equally.

Any future area code relief has no impact on customers.

The overlay would be the most beneficial alternative for the customers

Cons:

If only the 7-d number is advertised an overlay requires stationery and advertising changes

Customers will be required to dial 1+10 digit dialing for all calls

An overlay is more expensive for Frontier Telco than a split

### **REVIEW OF THE PUBLIC INPUT**

Joe reviewed the CPUC Staff's summary of the input from the public meetings. Joe mentioned that the common theme expressed at the public meetings was the public did not want to lose their 760 NPA – and many automatically assumed they would keep it if there was a split. It was noted the school district in Imperial County favored alternative # 1 since it believed alternative # 4 would split part of their school district in Salton rate center from the rest of the district. There were several comments in all of the public meeting locations not wanting to experience a change in their area code (from a split) again since they have changed several times over the years. It was noted the public's primary concern expressed at the public meetings was to retain the 760 area code and not about keeping 7-digit dialing.

The staff's summary of the input from the public at the public meetings plus emails and via the website is as follows:

The CPUC 760 website generated an excellent response with over 1,000 customers commenting, plus 70 comments were emailed to the Public Advisor. In addition the meetings generated approximately 200 written comments from individuals representing the local jurisdictions, businesses, and residential consumers and there were 39 spoken preferences at the public meetings. The data compiled identifies that approximately 46% of the customers expressed a preference for split alternative # 1, approximately 13% expressed a preference for split alternative # 4 and approximately 20% expressed a preference for the overlay.

Split Plan #1	605
Split Plan #4	170
Overlay	268
Split # 1 or Overlay	3
Undecided	86
No Preference	20
No Preference but wants to keep 760	2
None	152
Un-named split	15
TSO	7
Hexadecimal	<u>1</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1329</b>

### **CONSENSUS ON ONE OF THE TWO SPLITS PRESENTED TO PUBLIC**

Joe stated that the industry already proposed Alt # 4, of the two split alternatives presented to the public, if the Commission desires a split instead of the industry's recommended overlay. The industry also noted that the public support for a split also assumed they would be on the side of the split that kept the 760 area code.

### **STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD:**

***Statement for the record from Verizon Wireless & T-Mobile:*** "Verizon Wireless and T-Mobile exclusively support an overlay for the 760 NPA. The companies believe that an overlay is the superior form of relief and that it is best aligned with the views of the public as presented during the local jurisdiction meetings."

***Cricket Communications and Telscape Communications concurred with the statement.***

### **QUESTIONS & POINTS OF INTEREST**

Joe raised a point of interest with the industry: NANPA has already assigned the relief NPA – 442. If a 2-way split or an overlay is used the 442 would be assigned. Joe noted if a split is ordered the CPUC would need to decide which side changes to the new NPA.

### **SPECIFIC INDUSTRY RECOMMENDATIONS**

The industry still recommends the overlay. Therefore, NANPA will submit a petition for authority to implement an overlay, Alternative # 3, but with a second recommendation of Alternative # 4 from the industry if the Commission desires a split.

### **REVIEW OF DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**

Joe stated he would have the draft minutes and the draft petition on NNS in the next two weeks – no later than March 28, 2007 and the next meeting to review and approve them would be at 10 am (PT) on April 18, 2007, after which the petition would be filed with the CPUC.

There were no further discussion items and the meeting was adjourned.

# # #

**760 NPA – CALIFORNIA  
Follow-up to public meetings  
VIA CONFERENCE CALL  
March 14, 2007 - PARTICIPANTS**

**Attachment 1**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>COMPANY</b>
Marcy Baxter	AT&T
Renate Howell	AT&T
George Guerra	AT&T
Micki Burton	AT&T
Jerome Candelaria	CCTA
Holly Kuester	Charter Communications
Wes Jackert	Cingular
Sandra Gore	Cox Telecom
Sue Wong	CPUC
Mike Evans	CPUC
Valerie Endlich	Cricket Communications
Sue Lamb	Fones 4 All
Leslie Miklos	Level 3 Communications
Joe Cocke	NANPA Relief Planning
Wayne Milby	NANPA Relief Planning
Joe Rano	NANPA CO Code Administration
Beth Sprague	NANPA CO Code Administration
Kevin Gatchell	NeuStar Pooling Administration
Linda Taberna	PacWest Communications
Joe Hurlbert	Sprint
Maureen Matthews	Telscape Communications
Paula Jordan	T-Mobile
Dianne Hart	Time Warner Telecom
Tom Pease	Time Warner Telecom
Yun Lee	Verizon
Dyan Adams	Verizon
Lorraine Kocen	Verizon
Joanne Edelman	Verizon Wireless
Lolita Forbes	Verizon Wireless